

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 3, 2006 in which Claims 1-35 were rejected. With this response, claims 9, 17 and 24 are canceled with their limitations incorporated into claims 8, 14 and 20, respectively and claims 1, 8, 10-14, 21 and 32 are amended. Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-23 and 25-35, as amended, overcome the rejections and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Moshir and Okimoto.

Pages 2-6 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moshir et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020100036, in view of Okimoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,426,799. Claims 9, 17 and 24 are canceled with their limitations incorporated into claims 8, 14 and 20, respectively and claims 1, 8, 10-14, 21 and 32 are amended. Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-23 and 25-35, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Moshir in view of Okimoto.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of configuring a hard copy output engine. The method includes receiving an electronic message including hard copy output engine configuration data from an undesignated web site through a firewall and configuring the hard copy output engine using the configuration data. The data transmitted through the firewall designates a hard copy output engine to be configured. Support for this amendment may be found in at least page 13, lines 3-10. Accordingly, no new matters believed to be added.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest transmission of an e-mail which includes output engine configuration data and that further specifies or designates a particular hardcopy output engine to be configured by the data. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Moshir fails to teach configuring

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

a hardcopy output engine using configuration data. As a result, the Office Action attempts to additionally rely upon Okimoto. However, like Moshir, Okimoto also fails to disclose transmitting an e-mail including output engine configuration data that specifies or designates a particular hardcopy output engine to be configured by the data. In contrast, Okimoto requires the processor on the printer side of the firewall to compare the format of the print mail with the available functions all the multiple printers and to determine which printer to switch to the needed function or format. Thus, claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Moshir and Okimoto. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claims 2, 8, 15, 20, 22 and 35

Claims 2, 8, 15, 20, 22 and 35, as amended, each recite configuring the hardcopy output engine via an embedded web server contained in the hardcopy output engine using the configuration data.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose the use of an embedded web server contained in the hardcopy output engine to configure the hardcopy output engine using the configuration data. Once again, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Moshir fails to disclose configuring a hardcopy output engine. As a result, the Office Action attempts to additionally rely upon Okimoto. In rejecting the claim 2, and the corresponding other claims, the Office Action refers to column 4, lines 21-67 and Figure 1 of Okimoto and asserts that Okimoto discloses use of an embedded web server contained in the hardcopy output engine using the configuration data. However, this characterization of Okimoto is incorrect. Nowhere does Okimoto disclose an embedded web server in the hardcopy output engine. Although Figure 1 illustrates mail servers 24 and 26, it is clear that mail servers 24 and 26 are not embedded web servers and are not included in any of printers 6, 14, 16 and 18. Likewise, column 4 says nothing about mail servers 24 and 26 being embedded web servers which are part of a printer. Thus, claims 2, 8, 15, 20, 22 and

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

35 overcome the rejection based upon Moshir and Okimoto. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 8 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

C. Claims 4, 11, 14, 21 and 29

Claims 4, 11, 14, 21 and 29, as amended, each recite receiving an e-mail through the firewall at a first user station or transmitting the electronic message to a user station (claim 29) and further forwarding the e-mail or electronic message to the hardcopy output engine.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest receiving the e-mail or the electronic message including the configuration data at a user station or transmitting the electronic message or the e-mail to a user station and further forwarding the e-mail or electronic message to the hardcopy output engine. Once again, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Moshir fails to disclose any e-mail including hardcopy output engine configuration data. Despite this acknowledgment, the Office Action solely relies upon Moshir for the alleged teaching of forwarding an e-mail including hardcopy output configuration data to the hardcopy output engine. Such reliance appears to be completely misplaced as (1) the Office Action itself acknowledges that Moshir fails to disclose any e-mail including hardcopy output configuration data and (2) that portion of Moshir cited by the Office Action, Paragraph [0052], says nothing about forwarding an e-mail to a hardcopy output engine. Okimoto does not satisfy the deficiencies of Moshir. Accordingly, claims 4, 11, 14, 21 and 29 overcome the rejection based on Moshir in view of Okimoto. Claims 15-16 and 18-20 depend from claim 14 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons. Claims 22-23 and a 25-26 depend from claim 21 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

D. Claims 5, 12, 20 and 25

Claims 5, 12, 20 and 25 each recite that the hardcopy output engine is configured via an embedded web server to set a threshold for an element chosen

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

from a group consisting of: pigmentation material, number of hours of operation and number of sheets of print media consumed.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose configuring a hardcopy output engine via an embedded web server to set a threshold for at least one of the noted elements. As noted above with respect to the rejection of claims 2, 8, 15, 20, 22 and 35 neither Moshir nor Okimoto disclose an embedded web server. Moreover, neither Moshir nor Okimoto further disclose that the embedded web server is used to set a threshold for the noted elements. Once again, Moshir does not in disclose configuring a hardcopy output engine. Okimoto merely switches a printer to a needed format depending upon the format of the print mail received. Thus, claims 5, 12, 20 and 25 overcome the rejection based upon Moshir in view of Okimoto.

E. Claim 7

Claims 7 depends from claimed 1 and further recites that the configuration data is prepared by determining a make and model for the hardcopy output engine; determining a serial number for the hardcopy output engine and determining user thresholds for consumables associated with the hardcopy output engine.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest hardcopy output engine configuration data that is prepared by determining a make and model for the hardcopy output engine, a serial number for the hardcopy output engine end user thresholds for consumables associated with the hardcopy output engine. Once again, as acknowledged by the Office get action, Moshir does not even disclose hardcopy output engine configuration data. Okimoto merely switches a printer to a needed format depending upon the format of the print mail received. Nowhere does Okimoto disclose determining the noted characteristics of the hardcopy output engine when preparing configuration data or determining user's thresholds for consumables associated with the hardcopy output engine. Thus, claim 7 overcomes the rejection for this additional reason.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

F. Claim 27

Claim 27 reciting method which includes a step of forming hardcopy output engine configuration data on a first side of the firewall based upon input received from a second side of the firewall and transmitting an electronic message including the configuration data through the firewall to a hardcopy output engine on the second side of the firewall.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the method of claim 27. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Moshir does not disclose hardcopy output engine configuration data. Okimoto does not disclose forming hardcopy output engine configuration data on a first side of the firewall based on input received from a second side of the firewall, the second side of the firewall being the same side of the firewall that includes the hardcopy output engine. Nowhere does Okimoto disclose that the sender of the print mail generates hardcopy output engine configuration data based on input received from the recipient of the print mail. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 27 is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 28-35 depend from claim 27 and are patentably distinct over Moshir and Okimoto for the same reasons.

G. Claim 31

Claim 31 depends from claimed 27 and further recites the step of transmitting an electronic message including an address of the hardcopy output engine from the second side of the firewall (i.e., the same side of the firewall that contains the hardcopy output engine) to the first side of the firewall.

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this step. In fact, the Office Action fails to establish even a prima facie case of obviousness in that the Office Action fails to address the limitations above claim 31 which are not found in claims 1-7. Thus, claim 31 overcome the rejection for this additional reason.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

H. Claim 34

Claim 34 depends from claimed 27 and further recites that providing the input comprises interacting with a web site on the first side of the firewall with a web browser on the second side in the firewall (the same side of the firewall as the hardcopy output engine).

Neither Moshir nor Okimoto, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest providing input to a web site on the first out of the firewall using a web browser on the same side of the firewall as the hardcopy output engine. Once again, Moshir fails to disclose hardcopy output engine configuration data. Okimoto says nothing about providing any import from the printer or computer receiving print mail to the sender of the print mail, were in configuration data is formed based upon such input. Thus, the rejection of claim 34 is improper and should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

IV. Conclusion.

Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-23 and 25-35 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any

Atty. Dkt. No. 10007582-1

extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 2, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276